

LSTA Advisory Committee  
*DRAFT* Meeting Minutes  
Comfort Suites, April 8-9, 2009

**Wednesday, April 8:** Noon – 4:00 pm  
(*New member orientation 10:00 – 11:45 a.m.; public hearing 1:00 p.m.*)

**Present:** Jan Adams, Dee Barabe, Roxane Bartelt, Pat Chevis, Garrett Erickson, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Becki George, Joan Johnson, Deborah Kabler, Patricia Laughlin, Mildred McDowell, Michael Sheehan, Tasha Saecker, and Lynn Stainbrook.

**Absent:** Bea Lebal

**Division Staff:** Terrie Howe, Rick Grobschmidt, Nancy Anderson, Mike Cross, Sally Drew, Bob Bocher, Barb Huntington, Donna Steffan, John DeBacher, David Sleasman.

**Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. by Terrie Howe. Terrie asked the group to introduce themselves for the benefit of new members.

**Review Agenda**

Howe reviewed the agenda and invited input for changes. There were none. Chevis moved, seconded by Sheehan to approve the agenda.

**Public Hearing**

Howe asked if anyone had input for the hearing.

Howe distributed the proposal, prepared by Becki George, for Public, School and Academic library collaboration grant category. She referred to the strategic visioning summit and the call for more collaboration, that organizations should forge more relationships with other similar organizations. This summit will foster greater collaboration among multi-type libraries.

She discussed the goals from the summit: the One-card program, robust bandwidth, libraries as anchor stores, universal literacy in all forms, and the need for librarians to bring resources to the people who need them (the embedded librarian). This category will allow librarians from multiple library types to work together to carry out those goals.

Lisa Strand appeared at the public hearing and spoke in support of a grant category for up to \$80,000 to study the economic impact of academic libraries in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Library Association Foundation (WLAF) would provide funding to disseminate the results. She discussed why such a study might help academic libraries meet challenges. She also noted that funding for new electronic resources was not funded in the biennial budget. She noted the community outreach mission that is increasingly important at academic libraries. She noted the previous LSTA programs for 2006 school media programs and their importance on student achievement, as well as the 2007 impact study of public libraries. She feels this would complete the research.

Implementation: the funds would be used to obtain an external contractor to conduct the study. WLA could help with the process as much as possible. WLA feels it is an appropriate use of LSTA funds and that the results could help make a persuasive argument to legislators about the importance of academic library support.

Howe asked whether the study would be just the UW system, or whether it would be all academic libraries. Strand said it would have to be determined in the RFP, but they had envisioned all academic libraries, including private and technical colleges. Adams asked whether the thrust of the study would be the students or the public or some combination. Strand said they were not going to cover student achievement so much as the academic impact of the libraries on the communities in which they are set. Laughlin asked whether the business community as well as the public impact would be included. Strand affirmed. Drew asked how you separate the impact of the library from the rest of the school or university. Strand said that there are some parallels to the public library study, but noted that it would be challenge for the researcher.

#### **Review Minutes of November 11-12, 2008 meeting**

Gilderson-Duwe noted page 2, last line, “conflict” instead of “contact;” and change “affect” to “effect” on page 4, second paragraph. Saecker moved, supported by Bartelt, to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion carried.

#### **DLTCL Administrator’s Remarks**

Grobschmidt welcomed new members to the advisory committee which has been a long standing tradition for Wisconsin. The Assistant Superintendent noted the importance of the LSTA programs, how they are used, and how they have been developed. He noted that the LSTA budget is healthier than in the recent past, with an increase instead of a decrease. He thanked the staff, particularly Howe, for the work in putting the materials together for the committee. He noted that the Division is currently short-staffed, and that a state hiring freeze is in place. He noted vacancies in PLD, R&LL and that IMTT has additional responsibilities from the economic recovery funds. He referred to the recent press indicating the increased use of public libraries in this difficult economic time. He asked that the committee consider the current climate and circumstances in libraries, and how the funds can best be put to use. He also indicated that there have been more requirements for reporting of how the funds are used to ensure they are used appropriately. He thanked the committee on behalf of the State Superintendent and said that Tony Evers would be assuming the duties when he takes office on July 6, 2009. He reminded the group that the Superintendent takes the committee’s recommendations into considerations but ultimately it is the State Superintendent who makes the final decisions. He pointed out that the superintendent-elect, Tony Evers, is a library supporter and mentioned public libraries twice in his acceptance speech. He also reported on the state biennial budget process and the proposal to fund public library systems entirely from Universal Service Funds.

#### **LSTA Coordinator’s Report**

Howe reviewed materials in the packet including the reimbursement form. She also referred the committee to the FAQ on LSTA Grants so the committee would all be aware of them. She is grateful to George Hall for his past preparation, but that any mistakes this year are her responsibility. She noted how Al Zimmerman’s retirement has affected all of us, particularly with the budget preparations.

On the FAQ, she asked them to consider the focus on allowable costs and the requirements for budget revisions. She said that allowable expenses and marketing for special needs is allowed, but not for most other purposes. She noted that there is a requirement that mini-grant recipients (public libraries) report on use of LSTA funds from the public library systems.

#### **Procedures for Discussion of LSTA Grant Categories and Conflict of Interest Policy**

Cross presented the LSTA process for discussion and noted that motions on the actual categories and amounts awarded will not occur until tomorrow. Regarding the confidentiality policy, he pointed out the relevant language that may preclude discussion, motions, or votes on certain categories as appropriate. He noted that uncertainties can be discussed with him or Howe for clarification. There were no questions.

## **LSTA 2009 and 2010 Budget Overview**

Cross reviewed the revised 2008 budget on the preliminary spreadsheet and said there is still some uncertainty about the 2009 funding levels. Moving on to the 2010 budget and noted a formula error that has been corrected. He noted that projections are conservative, and that there is some uncertainty due to vacancies within the public library development team and out at the Reference & Loan Library and when they might be filled.

### **Proposed 2009 Jobs Category**

Huntington reviewed the proposed use of the additional \$200,000 from IMLS that will be distributed to the public library systems upon receiving approved Jobs grant projects. Barb referred to the work already done in Janesville and the library's response to the GM plant closing. She had collected other examples of work being done by libraries in response to the declining economy. A non-competitive distribution to the library systems is proposed to quickly distribute funds into the field to assist with employment resources. It is designed to be broad and fairly open so that systems can attempt to meet local conditions in communities that are affected. She noted some of the possible uses. The category is designed to offer quick responses to the most immediate needs. She provided examples of many possible projects. Examples of partnering agencies are included.

Stainbrook replied that she considers it a wonderful, appropriate, and timely response and use of LSTA funds. Johnson said that, even in libraries that have already been doing the work, this will allow those efforts to be expanded and supplemented. Adams asked her to discuss the 10 additional Vista workers and how they would be related to the project. Huntington said that the news of the additional Vistas was already in process and that it dovetailed with this project.

Howe asked Huntington to explain the form that will be used to solicit grant projects. Instead of a 10-page grant form, the current online LSTA application would be used and only certain pages would need to be completed. Erickson asked whether there are online resources that would have universal interest. Cross referred to the Learning Express reference database on the summary. Some systems and libraries are already subscribed, meaning there would be an overlap with a statewide contract. He referenced also the difficulty in making a large state procurement in a rapid manner. Grobschmidt said that the Governor's office anticipates state unemployment to approach ten percent. He noted that the superintendent and the deputy superintendent are both supportive of this category.

Chevis moved, seconded by Laughlin, to put this project in place for 2009. The motion carried. Stainbrook commended the staff for developing the creative special use quickly.

### **Consideration of Preliminary Grant Categories for 2010**

#### *Delivery Service*

Drew reviewed that it is a subsidy for the backbone delivery system and for extending it from the northern point in Wausau to the NWLS through a private vendor. There is no proposed increase. Laughlin asked what vehicles are used and the fuels, whether hybrid or alternative fuels are used. Drew said that they have experimented with alternative fuels. Laughlin noted that some of the school districts are experimenting with reprocessed cooking oils, and suggest this get referred to the delivery committee. DeBacher said he had admired the efforts made by the SCLS delivery service and assumes that those same efforts on efficiency translate to their statewide contract.

### *Digitization – Local Resources*

Drew reviewed the category and noted failures in some of the early, open projects, and why the current UW process has been successful through their administration and hand-holding for local projects and hosting them for statewide access. They conduct all the scanning, capture metadata and integrate the metadata into the project. They can accommodate special and fragile materials, as well as high-volume, automated scanners. She has been happy with the results and mentoring that has been provided.

She recommends continuing the project and funding it at a \$30,000 level, removing the restriction on libraries that had previously participated. Stainbrook noted that, in her past experience, the cataloging has been the hang-up for local projects. She asked how the cost-per-image is broken down. Drew corrected her document, saying that the current cost is \$.75 to \$3.00 per image. Stainbrook asked how small libraries are able to carry out the tagging for local projects and whether the systems have assisted in those efforts.

### *Digitization – Large Libraries*

Drew noted that this topic has been brought up previously. There are some libraries that have considerable materials to digitize and would like to digitize in-house. The Wisconsin Heritage Online (WHO) project had also tried to address this need. Some have felt that having everything in the Wisconsin collection was not as effective in conducting a project more tailored to local needs. This is another attempt to address some of the concerns that have been aired. This would provide the opportunity to undertake a larger project locally. The design is for the grant to be a subsidy, so that the projects will not offset more economical projects conducted by the UW system. These would need to be compatible with the WHO project so that the results can be harvested by their server. Johnson asked how the subsidy level would be addressed.

Stainbrook asked whether the population limit should be lowered to allow more libraries in large metropolitan areas to participate. Gilderson-Duwe and Erickson expressed some interest. Drew said that this year's proposal is to begin a process, and the intent is not to move work or projects away from the UW platform. Adams wondered if the materials could be sent out to another vendor (not the UW) for the initial scanning. Drew noted that the scanning is the least costly and complicated part of the project. It is access and description that are the challenges. Kabler asked whether the UW could absorb projects of this scale, and that is why the new category is proposed. Drew said that, no, the UW likes the larger projects, since less setup and training is involved.

### *Innovative Use of Technology*

Bob referred to the relatively new category and the funding levels of the first two years. The element of "innovation" is difficult to define, so it is left to the reviewers to help to determine whether the particular grant application yields innovation in the local situation, ranking them accordingly. He suggested that the limit of \$20,000 maximum per system be restored when a motion is made tomorrow.

### *Library Improvement*

Cross reviewed the activities that are conducted in this category. He said the only change from prior years have been changes in salaries, benefits, and indirect costs.

### *Public Library System Technology*

Bob distinguished the category from the "innovative" category—that it has been in place for a number of years, and that the total available funds is much more considerable (\$350,000 proposed), distributed on a formula basis. He gave some examples and restrictions of the use of funds. Grobschmidt asked, related to this grant, whether it is known how many people go to libraries because they have no internet access of their own. Bocher reported that, nationally, about 25% of the population has no Internet access at home, and 75% seek broadband access at the library.

### *Reference and Loan*

Drew noted that \$713,600 is the requested budget amount. She reviewed activities of her staff and other costs that are covered by the funds, all of which are intensive in their technology requirements. About a third of her salary as well as other salaries for her staff, are paid by the funds.

### *Virtual Reference*

Drew reported on the development and growth of the service and of the issue of continued funding. Increases have been passed on.

### *WISCAT*

Funding pays for the cost of the vendor and software, as well as the staff who work with the project to manage the software and training to libraries. CCBC reviews have been added to WISCAT. They also integrated the BadgerNet databases into the federated search options. Integrating local ILS systems into the resource sharing has continued to be a challenge. A connection to WiLS through Illiad has been successful, since OCLC has not been cooperative with direct linking. She noted that there are not increases to WISCAT user fees except the vendor costs, since state staff increases are not anticipated.

### *Shared Integrated Library System for Schools' Study*

Steffan believes that this is a good time to bring all the data that has been collected on resource sharing among school systems and show how it has impacted school library media specialists staff time and other impacts. They would like to hire a research consultant to review the two projects and ascertain how feasible resource sharing can be and what the long-term goal might be, with school-based consortia or school-public consortia. Howe noted that this is a new category suggestion. Chevis asked about the two pilots that were conducted. Steffan noted they were both through CESA 10 with two districts and five libraries. Last year four very small rural districts, with six libraries were added. The collections have been integrated, with the hardware and support hosted at the CESA, with delivery of materials provided by CESA van service. They overcame their anxiety about "losing their stuff" and learned that their teachers now have access to more resources. A stumbling block was getting full support for professional development training for the teachers.

### *Statewide Library Access (Card)*

Drew noted that this category has come out of the COLAND Visioning Summit. The goal is to use a local library card at other libraries throughout the state. She thinks there needs to be development of the desired outcome and the desired features before substantial progress can be made. She noted that there are some technologies that could be applied and those could be explored in this initial phase to develop general parameters. LITAC has reviewed the topic and it has been discussed with COLAND.

In 2009, this might require a facilitator and meetings, as well as graphic development. 2010 would continue planning and might include outside technical assistance to propose solutions. There were \$13,000 in costs estimated for 2009 and \$38,000 for 2010. Stainbrook asked where the 2009 costs were going to come from. Cross said that they would be primarily from carryover funds.

### *Web Conferencing Software*

Chevis asked if this would be an annual or one-time fee. (It is an annual fee but the category is proposed as a one-time category.) Howe said that the Webinar package includes the small meeting provisions for GoToMeeting. Chevis noted that the amount of training available for her staff probably tripled when these remote solutions were implemented.

### *Jobs – Searching & Training Support*

Huntington described how the non-competitive 2009 project would be expanded in 2010, with \$100,000 available for competitive grants for individual libraries or groups of libraries or systems.

### *Literacy*

The original category is very broad, so this category can now encompass the adolescent projects that may be inspired by the adolescent initiative. She is requesting a funding level of \$250,000. Cross noted that the new Obama administration encourages early literacy, which still could be considered.

Barb will cover Accessibility on Thursday.

### *Library Improvement*

Grobschmidt reviewed the projects and services covered by the \$25,000 included in this category. Laughlin said that the annual report requests trustee email addresses. She felt that these email addresses should be used to inform them of availability of the PDF version of Channel. Grobschmidt said we could try to achieve an “opt in” for CW subscriptions to trustees, based on the annual report information.

### *LSTA Administration*

Howe reviewed the costs and budget of this category.

### *Library Planning Projects*

We are recommending that this category not be funded. Gilderson-Duwe asked about the Health category and wondered why it was zeroed out. Howe reported that the funding had been reallocated to the Jobs category but that the category could be resumed in the future.

### *Statewide Library Development*

Cross reviewed this category and that it funds part of his as well as Huntington’s position. We may need to fund a new partial position to carry out the statewide data collection, if we are unsuccessful in filling Al Zimmerman’s position, which is why \$50,000 is set aside for that purpose. The category includes the SLP and the statewide meetings of system directors, special needs consultants; youth services consultants, and continuing education consultants.

### *School Library Media Staffing Summit*

This was proposed by Cal Potter at COLAND to help address the cuts to professional media center staff in school districts. This would allow a summit on the big issue with all types of participants to achieve a solution or resolution.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. until Thursday.

### *Accessibility*

Huntington reported on the proposed special needs accessibility category and how it has changed from the 2009 guidelines with limited scope when the category was limited to \$51,000. This year \$200,000 was requested to distribute to the 17 library systems to aid in library accessibility.

Johnson asked for clarification about materials that had been allowed, specifically GED materials, and why there is language limiting purchases.

Stainbrook asked about the 2009 *Innovative Use of Technology* and why it had been limited to \$47,000. Bocher explained the number of applications received and the number of awards distributed. DeBacher explained that the next ranked applicant was for substantially, larger and the point ranking was substantially lower than the funded projects. She also asked why the health category has been

recommended to be dropped. Howe explained that it was a fund-based decision, but that the committee could certainly move to put the category back in. There were only three applicants and all three were funded. Laughlin noted that directors often look at what grants were funded and use those projects for ideas. She also thinks it is a shame that the category was cut.

Gilderson-Duwe asked about the \$50,000 “set aside” for statewide data collection position and whether it is certain that those funds would be required. Cross explained that the Division hopes that the funds will not be needed and state funds can be used to fill the vacancy. But if that is not allowed, it may help to fill the position with partial LSTA funding. Gilderson-Duwe also suggested that he thinks cutting the Jobs category to \$100,000 in the second year (with competitive grants) may be short sighted and not adequate. Cross wondered if as much training will be required in the next year, and that he may have had wishful thinking that employment would not be as much of an issue in 2010.

Johnson asked about the \$20,000 for the school media summit and wondered what impact that project would or could have. She wondered whether the decision to make cuts is at the level of the building administrator and wondered if such a summit will have necessary impact. Anderson responded that the expectation is that this will produce better understanding district-wide and at individual schools of the importance of media specialists, and better adherence to the recommended standards. George noted that when school districts look at cutting library media positions at schools, they look at staff-student ratios, where media specialists are not counted, so those positions look more attractive for cuts. She noted Turtle Lake as an example where a vacancy was posted as a 2/5 instead of a full position.

George had questions about the school shared system study—why is a study of studies being done? Adams suggested that perhaps the collaborative category could be expanded in scope to see if more public-school collaboration projects could be done to expand the examples that could be used in a study. She suggested combining the shared school study funds and the multi-type collaboration funds for one category. She and George had discussed the possibilities. She said she had discussed possibilities with John Thompson at Indianhead Federated Library System (IFLS) to explore increased communication in their region. She wondered if this could be an opportunity to show Wisconsin as a leader nationally in collaboration that works between multi-type libraries. In addition, she wonders if the category she proposed could be included as a category on the projected spreadsheet. Cross noted that the spreadsheet handout lists the staff-proposed categories and other categories can be added by the committee.

Chevis added that the accessibility category is necessary, but that directors at small or medium-sized libraries can purchase adaptive items locally because of their federal mandate more easily than something like health literacy training. She wonders if the added funds for accessibility might better be spread out or added to other categories. Huntington noted that the competitive category was eliminated, but Chevis suggested that non-competitive categories can lead to waste or unnecessary spending. Laughlin noted that her library does not have any accessible access between floors, but will never get an elevator until they do a new building project. This category will not benefit the library enough to do what is necessary. They have more success with the Lions Club for more substantial projects. Cross noted that LSTA funds cannot be used for construction; that even the door openers had raised some red flags at the federal level. Laughlin said she understands that an elevator cannot be bought with LSTA, that she was trying more to support what Chevis had said, that spreading the funds out statewide is not as useful as focusing it where necessary.

Steffan added that the study of the shared system was proposed because they had data from the demonstration project, but wanted more perspective on a broader or long-range direction for shared studies in schools. Gilderson-Duwe noted that the demonstrations have been funded for two years, so this would wrap up that project. Stainbrook thought \$30,000 is a lot of money to pay for a “wrap up.” She thinks the funds could be better applied to other areas and wonders if a study could be done for \$10,000.

Steffan noted that a similar amount was budgeted for the shared integrated library system study that had been done.

Laughlin asked for clarification about the statewide library card project and wondered why there was a component to design a library card. Why is it called “one card, any library?” She wondered why there is a presumption about one library card. Drew explained that she had put it in because it had so frequently been discussed as a possible direction to take. She noted that COLAND was anxious to see something happen in this area. She tends to agree that the suggestion of doing a physical “card” may not be the direction to go. Laughlin said that the “one card everywhere” concept sets a tone that might cause more controversy than it can correct. Adams noted that in her region there is already some universality in their library card use. Drew said the concept might be expanded to other resources beyond physical checkout. Anderson asked if there is a re-framing that might make it more palatable. Laughlin said to take out the component of “one card,” that could be a barrier to discussion. Steffan suggested it might be more of a universal access to resources at all libraries. Adams wondered if it might run afoul of LSTA limits on promoting. Cross said that advertising is not allowed and that there are limits to the marketing that can be done. Chevis asked if the description could be changed to eliminate the “one card,” and also the design component.

Grobschmidt said COLAND was adamant about having a program. Cross said a “statewide library card” could be done quick-and-dirty; Gilderson-Duwe added that there would be very spotty participation. George asked if it is a collaboration project. Drew said that much of the concept already exists, at least among public libraries. In some areas the academic libraries are fairly “open,” but not in others. Cross added that it is very much a collaboration project. Howe noted that she has a number of library cards for libraries around the state, but what some want is a single card. Stainbrook confessed that she was at the summit where this came up. She said that there was considerable discussion in the group and that there was an idea of a logo. Chevis said that this kind of a discussion is what will happen as a project proceeds. She suggest that the title be changed to “universal library access” and delete reference to the “statewide one-card” concept, and let it proceed.

Chevis asked how the decision process proceeds. She asked to go through all the categories and then go back to make changes.

### **Recommendations on Grant Categories and Budget for 2010**

Chevis moved seconded by Johnson to fund delivery at \$90,000. No discussion. Passed, Sheehan abstained.

Chevis moved digitization at \$30,000, seconded by Stainbrook. No discussion. Unanimously carried.

Gilderson-Duwe moved Jobs Search and Employment at \$150,000, noting that there will be more need than anticipated, and the effort will need to be maintained. Seconded by Laughlin. Stainbrook asked whether the group could reconsider amounts (yes). The motion carried unanimously.

Chevis moved to fund Web Conferencing software at \$18,000, seconded by Stainbrook. Gilderson-Duwe asked if this goes to systems and wondered whether he must abstain. Cross said it is non-competitive; technically he would not need to abstain, unless they are sole recipient, though it might be good to abstain. The motion carried, Gilderson-Duwe and Sheehan abstained.

Stainbrook proposed funding digitization; large library resources at \$30,000, Gilderson-Duwe seconded the motion. Her rationale for funding at less than \$60,000 is because she represents one of the qualifying



libraries but the Brown County Library would not be ready to apply. Johnson and Laughlin asked for clarification on the conflict of interest issue. The motion carried with Erickson abstaining.

Adams moved to fund WISCAT at the recommended amount \$608,500, seconded by Saecker. The motion carried unanimously.

Stainbrook made the recommendation to fund Innovative Use of Technology category at \$50,000, seconded by Chevis. Motion carried.

The group took a break at 9:50

Saecker moved Public library technology at \$350,000, seconded by Johnson. Passed with Gilderson-Duwe and Sheehan abstaining.

George recommended the Multi-type library collaboration at \$25,000, with Stainbrook seconding. Category would be included under Library Improvement. The motion carried.

Gilderson-Duwe moved seconded by Adams funding R&LL at the recommended amount, \$713,600.

Sheehan recommended that Virtual Reference be funded at \$73,000. Seconded by George. Carried, with Laughlin opposed.

Chevis moved Communications & Planning at \$25,000, seconded by Saecker. No discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

Bartelt moved literacy seconded by Pat. Gilderson-Duwe lamented that it could not be funded at a higher amount than \$250,000. The motion carried.

Chevis moved Accessibility for systems at \$150,000, seconded by Sheehan. There was no discussion. The motion carried with Gilderson-Duwe abstaining.

Mildred seconded by George to fund the School media summit at \$20,000. The motion carried without discussion.

Stainbrook moved to reinstate the Health Awareness & Access category at \$20,000 as it was proposed last year. Laughlin seconded. No discussion. Carried unanimously.

Saecker moved LSTA administration at the recommended amount of \$126,517 seconded by Stainbrook. The motion carried.

Chevis moved to fund Library Improvement at proposed amount (\$333,068). Sheehan seconded. Chevis asked about the \$50,000 for data collection. Cross said it could be reallocated at the November meeting if not needed. Motion carried unanimously.

Stainbrook moved the “formerly known as library card,” seconded by Johnson at the recommended amount of \$30,000. Motion carried.

Chevis moved Library Improvement Development at the recommended amount of \$140,500, seconded by Gilderson-Duwe. The motion carried without discussion.

Adams moved to add \$20,000 to the Multi-type Planning and Collaboration to increase it to \$45,000. Chevis seconded. Chevis clarified that the purpose of expanding is to encourage public libraries to add school libraries to create a larger pool of examples for the study of school shared systems. George asked whether this would be the final year of the study. George is concerned that merging the two categories into a competitive category might confuse the two. Adams wondered if there might be other types of possible multi-type shared systems with schools. Chevis asked Steffan whether the study would show what is going on nation-wide with school shared systems. Steffan said they perhaps might not have enough data and should continue the initiative and encourage more participation in public library shared systems. Chevis asked if the study is to find out whether the project was successful. Steffan said it is to more carefully develop a position to take for schools in shared systems. Chevis: if they funded it at \$15,000 and that was not enough, could it be expanded. Steffan said it would then become a two-year study. Stainbrook asked if the scope could instead be narrowed instead of broadened, since she thinks \$30,000 is so much. Sheehan said there would be data from the first two years, but wondered if there would be enough data from any new projects in expanding this multi-type category. Adams said her hope is to have more examples or options to study and look at before making recommendations through a study. Gilderson-Duwe expressed the voices from previous committee members, of skepticism of funding these shared systems and the lack of goals. The most he's heard of talk of resource sharing emerging from this was yesterday when Steffan referred to it. Last fall there was talk of bursts of circulation, but not, up until now, any discussion about increased resource sharing. The project may be no more than funding schools' shared automation systems. Adams agreed that the study amount may be excessive based on the size of their project. Gilderson-Duwe, speaking to the multi-type category, said that he is in favor of leaving the amount at \$25,000, then expanding it later if there are considerable applications or if it should be continued or expanded next year. George added that she would like to see the shared project closed off and keep the multi-type category done separately.

Adams and Chevis withdrew their motion.

George moved to fund the shared system study at \$20,000 instead of \$30,000. Adams was unsure, though Steffan thought it may be achievable. Chevis seconded the motion. The motion carried after discussion.

Chevis asked about when WLA foundation came last fall, whether there was a motion about the academic study. She moved to fund an academic library economic impact study for \$30,000. Cross and Howe clarified that North Star had been the lowest bidder and that costs for this study could be considerably higher. Chevis thought that the \$30,000 could be seed money toward a project funded by additional amounts raised by the WLA foundation. Chevis thought discussion and action should be done as a courtesy to WLAF. Drew asked if this discussion should happen now or if it should be done as a possible future category? DeBacher expressed his skepticism about how such a study would be done and it would be difficult to develop since no study has been done elsewhere. He pointed out that academics at Florida compiled a whole process for the public library study in 2000 before a 2004 study was actually conducted. Howe wondered how electronic resources available only to the students would be included. Chevis said that the discussion might better be conducted as a "future project."

There was also expressed concern about the difficulty of "starting a study from scratch," and concern that doing a study without adequate direction and preparation could be divisive.

Stainbrook asked about the closing of job centers or other state offices and how that impacts public libraries. She wondered if demonstration projects could be conducted to provide facilities for state agency processes if some funding would come along with the task, so that libraries are not burdened with an extra responsibility without funding. She wondered if demonstration grants might be available or even whether LSTA would be an appropriate source of funding. Chevis expressed some skepticism whether the work, such as hunting licenses, would be put on public libraries without their assent. Laughlin noted that her

library has been inundated with online job applications. Persons have been sent to libraries having never used a computer. Huntington pointed out how that occurs, that agencies make assumptions that the libraries are already equipped with computers and provide training, and that agencies make inaccurate assumptions. Chevis said many libraries have been able to limit the amount of assistance they are able to, or equipped to provide. Erickson noted that in Marathon County they process passports, but there is a payment they receive for the service. DeBacher wondered if doing pilot projects might create an assumption that libraries might be expected to provide services for other agencies. Chevis suggested that job application assistance might be a category that could be measured and compiled. Laughlin suggested that, with the Jobs categories, the libraries might be expected to report the number of people helped on their final grant reports. DeBacher suggested that such information could be required for the competitive grants in 2010. George noted that statistics, and collecting them, is important in a library, so that asking public libraries in this job initiative would not be an unreasonable. Huntington pointed out that the measures would have to be done without necessarily identifying people as unemployed or specifically seeking employment. Huntington noted that she had talked to staff about the VISTA program for the summer public library slots. Johnson said that the VISTAs in Milwaukee Public have been a challenge since they cannot do direct services. The work plan must be constantly changed and adapted since it is difficult having them solely do administrative work. Huntington pointed out that the public library VISTA placement is relatively new for DPI's program.

#### **Review of LSTA Process for 2010**

Howe directed the committee members to the 2009 timetable in the Information and Guidelines booklet, and that a similar timeline would be used for the 2010 timetable. She referred to the tasks to be accomplished at the fall meeting. She and Cross outlined how the grant submission would change as a new forms application is being adopted at DPI. Cross invited comments and input for the form and content of the application. He noted that, over the years, there have been minor changes. Stainbrook noted that the forms for LSCA were daunting enough, and that the forms used now could still be simplified to attract directors of smaller libraries, and those who have not applied previously, would be more encouraged to apply. She asked about available training and Huntington said she intended to do a web training that would be archived and available. Stainbrook suggested directing people to the website with the history and abstract of the grants.

The next meeting will be November 11-12<sup>th</sup>, 2009 on a similar schedule. Grobschmidt thanked not only the committee, but the Division staff members as well, for the work in carrying out the LSTA program. The Superintendent will review the recommendations and take those into account in setting the categories. Stainbrook asked whether the committee would be apprised of her decision and Grobschmidt said that the results would be announced.

The committee adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

Recorded by John DeBacher